

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 remain active in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a step of selecting a predetermined grinding wheel. Basis for this can be found in the sentence bridging pages 8-9 in the specification (“The removable amount of grinding portion by the grinding wheel T1 is differ from the removable amount of grinding portion by the other grinding wheel T2 in certain grinding process in order to terminate the grinding by the grinding wheel T1 prior to the termination of the grinding by the other grinding wheel T2”). It is therefore inherent, from the stated intention to so terminate the operation of grinding wheel T1 prior to that of the other wheel, that the grinding wheel T1 has been selected as a predetermined grinding wheel whose grinding is terminated prior to a termination of grinding by the other grinding wheel.


Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by EP ‘621. Applicant had previously explained that according to the invention the grinding step is performed so that grinding by a predetermined grinding wheel is terminated prior to the termination of grinding by the other grinding wheel. The order of termination of the grinding operations is therefore predictable, and so can be relied upon to control grinding more accurately (see sentence bridging pages 3 and 4). On the other hand, EP ‘621 does not disclose that grinding by a predetermined grinding wheel is terminated prior to the termination of grinding by the other grinding wheel since, if it were known in advance in EP ‘621 that the predetermined one of the grinding wheels 14 or 15 will have finished the grinding operation before the other wheel, there would be no need to test whether the grinding portion ground by an undetermined “either” wheel has reached the required value.

In response, the Examiner has stated (paragraph 6) that "[i]f applicant has a specific step of determining which wheel is to be stopped first, it should be claimed." This has now been done, and so this rejection is believed to be moot.

Applicant therefore believes that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicits an early Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
RTP:smi

---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599

Robert T. Pous  
Registration No. 29,099  
Attorneys of Record